Registered—No. M. 1175.

271

The Mysore Gazette.

Vol. 63.] PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY. [No. 32

BANGALORE, THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1928.

PART I.

IMPORTANT GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT.

Issues revised instructions *re* Units for purposes of appointments in Municipalities.

READ—

Government Order No. L. 6052-125—Ml. 158-26-1, dated 1st March 1927, issuing rules regulating Recruitment, pay, etc., of certain officers and servants of Town and Minor Municipal Councils.

2. Government Order No. 3-62—C. R. B., dated 9th October 1927, laying down revised instructions regarding officers to be treated as Unit Officers for purposes of appointments in the several Departments.

ORDER NO. 1039-1338—C. R. B. 5-28-1, DATED 31ST JULY 1928.

According to the Government Order dated 9th October 1927, read above, each of the Local Bodies except the Mysore City Municipality is a Unit for purposes of recruitment to the subordinate ranks of the public service. It is observed that as the establishment employed in most of the Minor Municipal Councils is very limited and as interchange of Government servants and Municipal employees will be often necessitated in pursuance of Government Order dated 1st March 1927, the Minor Municipal Councils may better be included in the Unit pertaining to the Deputy Commissioners of the Districts concerned. Government are accordingly pleased to direct in modification of their Order dated 9th October 1927 read above, that the two City Municipalities and all Municipalities for which non-official gentlemen are Presidents, be regarded as independent Units. All other Municipalities will be regarded as included in the Units of the respective Deputy Commissioners of Districts who, as Unit Officers for the District, will be responsible for the correct classification of all the vacancies occurring in the Municipalities of the District, to scrutinise the "A" & "B" statements in respect of the same and to furnish the prescribed returns and reports to the Central Recruitment Board.

N. MADHAVA RAO,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Explains the true position in respect of criticisms in the public press about the Krishnarajasagara and Iron Works projects.

ORDER NO. 575-9—C. B. 36-28-1, DATED 6TH AUGUST 1928.

The Publicity Officer to Government has from time to time contradicted various erroneous statements to which currency was given in the public press, in respect of the combined hydro-electric and irrigation scheme, known as the Krishnarajasagara Project, in the valley of the Cauvery River.

Similar mis-statements respecting the Bhadravati Iron Works were corrected publicly from time to time by the Board of Management as well as, individually, by the Chairman and the General Manager of the Iron Works.

A summary of the criticisms made in respect of these works from time to time and the actual facts regarding each were called for from the officers in charge of the two undertakings, and the statements received from them are published as an accompaniment to this Order.

2. The Krishnarajasagara Scheme, to the extent it has advanced, has fully come up to expectations and the newly started Irwin Canal Scheme is also, in the opinion of competent experts, likely to be remunerative.

3. The Iron Works were over-capitalized during construction, for reasons already placed before the public. The undertaking has also had to face a prolonged depression in the Iron and Steel trade since it started operation in January 1923. Such projects have to be judged in the light of experience of similar works outside the State and considering that the work is still young, the progress is not disappointing. Government are satisfied that no effort is being spared to develop the Works along right lines. They are also satisfied that most of the allegations are untrue and the fears expressed about the future of the undertaking are groundless.

N. MADHAVA RAO,
Chief Secretary to Government.

ANNEXURE I.

KRISHNARAJASAGARA COMBINED HYDRO-ELECTRIC AND IRRIGATION PROJECT.

Allegations.	*Explanation of the true position.*
The Dam is not strong enough to store water up to 124′ or even up to 118′.	This criticism was examined in detail by the Committee presided over by Sir Frederick St. John Gebbie and that Committee have stated that "the profile of the dam, notwithstanding the rear scours which have been effectively repaired, has ample strength to store water up to 124 feet above bed." The report of the Committee has been already published in a Government Communique dated the 30th March 1925.
2. The Dam and Canal have been deliberately underestimated.	The allegation is not borne out by facts. Government Order No. 328-336—K. R. S. 1826-34, dated 23rd December 1925, shows clearly that the excess was due to special circumstances, such as, a change in the height of storage and dam by six feet and a few other features, long delay in execution owing to the Cauvery Arbitration and rise of prices and rates during and after the war. The main cause of the excess, namely, the rise in rates, was due to the value of money going down after the War. In fact, almost every estimate had to be revised as the result of war conditions.